| 1 | Matthew Borden, Esq. (SBN: 214323) | | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 2 | borden@braunhagey.com David H. Kwasniewski, Esq. (SBN: 281985) | | |
| 3 | kwasniewski@braunhagey.com Tracy O. Zinsou, Esq. (SBN: 295458) | | |
| 4 | zinsou@braunhagey.com BRAUNHAGEY & BORDEN LLP | | |
| 5 | 351 California Street, 10th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 | | |
| 6 | Telephone: (415) 599-0210 Facsimile: (415) 599-0210 | | |
| 7 | Attorneys for Defendant | | |
| 8 | YummyEarth, Inc. | | |
| 9 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 10 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 11 | Case No: 3:22-cv-02739-VC | | |
| 12 | JENNIFER MARINO, | DECLARATION OF MATTHEW BORDEN IN SUPPORT OF DFENDANT YUMMYEARTH, INC.'S MOTION FOR | |
| 13 | Plaintiff, | | |
| 14 | V. | SANCTIONS | S |
| 15 | YUMMYEARTH, INC., | Date: | September 14, 2023 |
| 16 | Defendant. | Time: Judge: | 10:00 a.m. Hon. Vince Chhabria |
| 17 | | Court Rm.: | 4 |
| 18 | | Compl. Filed | : May 8, 2022 |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| | | | Case No. 3:22-ev-02739-VC |

BORDEN DECL. ISO DEFENDANT YUMMYEARTH, INC.'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

- 1. I represent Defendant YummyEarth, Inc. ("YumEarth"). I make this declaration based on personal knowledge. If called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to the facts stated herein.
- 2. My office has made substantial efforts to obtain Plaintiff's deposition that began in November of 2022. Pursuant to Local Rule 30-1, we wrote to Plaintiff on November 29, 2022, December 7, 2022, and January 11, 2023, asking for dates for her deposition. On February 6, 2023, Plaintiff still had not provided any dates, so my office wrote to her: "In light of plaintiff's refusal to provide dates for her deposition, we propose noticing the deposition for March 8." This date was picked a month in advance of the deposition to give Plaintiff time to propose a new date or to clear any scheduling issues. On February 28, 2023, having still not received any dates from Plaintiff, our office served a deposition notice, setting her deposition for March 8, 2023. Plaintiff did not appear for deposition on March 8, 2023.
- 3. After Plaintiff refused to appear for deposition on March 8, 2023, our efforts to obtain her deposition continued. At one point we set the deposition for June 6, 2023, but that date had to be canceled because the notice did not specify that the deposition was to occur at our office. Immediately afterward, we sought new dates for Plaintiff's deposition.
- 4. On June 5, 2023, my office wrote to Plaintiff: "Please let us know when she is available to sit for an in-person deposition in the next two weeks." Plaintiff did not respond.
- 5. On June 9, 2023, my office wrote to Plaintiff: "Following up on this, please let us know as soon as possible when Ms. Marino is available for an in-person deposition at our California office. Thank you." Plaintiff did not respond.
- 6. On June 21, 2023, having received no response from Plaintiff, my office noticed Plaintiff's in-person deposition for July 11, 2023, and requested that Plaintiff let us know by June 28, 2023, if she was unavailable on that date.
- 7. On June 29, 2023, my office wrote "As you are aware, we noticed Plaintiff's inperson deposition for July 11 and requested that you provide us with alternative dates by June 28.

Having received no response, and as we previously noted, we will proceed with the deposition as noticed."

- 8. YumEarth retained a court reporter and videographer and spent substantial time preparing for the deposition, as detailed below.
- 9. Two business days before the deposition, Plaintiff claimed to have been surprised that the deposition was in person, even though we had sent four emails and a deposition notice reiterating this fact.
- 10. Plaintiff did not appear for her deposition on July 11, 2023, and she did not move for a protective order. To date, Plaintiff has not offered any alternative dates to be deposed.
- 11. Attached as **Exhibits 1-3** are true and correct copies of the email correspondence discussed in Paragraphs 4-7 above.

A. BHB Attorneys' Qualifications and Rates

- 12. BHB is a leading boutique law firm with offices in San Francisco and New York that routinely handle high-profile, complex litigation involving intellectual property, antitrust, unfair competition, and other commercial matters. We regularly appear before federal and state courts and arbitrators throughout the country to prosecute and defend claims involving a variety of business issues. Our clients run from Fortune 500 Companies to small businesses and encompass many different types of industries. We have successfully litigated and arbitrated disputes worth many billions of dollars.
- 13. In addition to complex commercial litigation, we also handle significant pro bono and impact litigation matters, such as litigation to stop book banning (see Little v. Llano County, 22-cv-00424-RP (W.D. Tex.), Dkt. 133 [granting injunction precluding government from removing books from the library]), litigation to protect the rights of the media at protests (see Index Newspapers v. City of Portland, 20-cv-1035-SI, Dkt. 157 [granting injunction precluding federal and state law enforcement from dispersing journalists from protests]), aff'd Index Newspapers v. U.S. Marshalls' Serv., 977 F.3d 817 (9th Cir. 2020)), litigation to protect the poorest and neediest nursing home residents from being dumped into the streets (see Mou v. SSC San Jose Operating Co., LP, No. 18-cv-01911-EJD (N.D. Cal.), Dkt. 119 [issuing injunction to prevent dumping of

- 14. I have personal knowledge of the rates charged and used in client pitches by other law firms in the Bay Area and in New York. Although our base pay for associates exceeds the "Cravath Scale" (i.e., the standard lockstep salaries paid by big firms), the rates that BHB charges its clients, and the rates paid by commercial clients, are substantially lower than the rates charged by the big firms and boutiques where our lawyers previously practiced, *e.g.*, Morrison & Foerster, LLP, Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP, Latham & Watkins, LLP, Keker & Van Nest LLP, and Munger, Tolles & Olson, LLP to name a few.
- 15. BHB's rates range from \$1,400 per hour for BHB's most senior partner to \$475 per hour for BHB's most junior associates. Most of our clients, including YumEarth, pay for our firm's services on an hourly basis. The rates given below are the rates that BHB's clients—and YumEarth in this case—actually pay. Our firm's past rates have been approved in fee application decisions issued by numerous courts, including the Ninth Circuit in *Walker v. B&G Foods, Inc., et al.*, No. 16-15349 (9th Cir., Jul. 20, 2017), *Optronic Technologies, Inc., v. Ningbo Sunny Electronic Co.*, Ltd., et al., Case No. 5:16-cv-06370 (N.D. Cal.), *Hill v. Robert's Am. Gourmet Food, Inc.*, No. C 13-80166 EDL (N.D. Cal.), *Hunt v. Sunny Delight Beverages Co.*, No. 18-cv-00557-JLS-DFM (C.D. Cal.), *Davis v. AG Seal Beach, LLC, et al.*, No. BC468346 (Los Angeles Super. Ct.), and *State of California ex rel. Todd Dominguez v. En Pointe Techs. Inc., et al.*, No. 37-2011-00100936-CU-BTL (San Diego Super. Ct.).
- 16. I am a founding partner of BHB. After law school, I clerked for the Honorable William Alsup in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. I practiced at Morrison & Foerster LLP before co-founding BHB. I have successfully tried cases in state and federal court and successfully argued appeals before the Ninth Circuit, the Federal Circuit and the California Courts of Appeal. I have successfully represented Fortune 500 companies, private equity